

*W. Sweet / Please  
return*

# HOMŒOPATHY VINDICATED:

## A REPLY

TO

DR. JOSEPH KIDD'S

“LAWS OF THERAPEUTICS.”

BY

E. W. BERRIDGE, M.D.

(MEDICAL REFEREE TO THE “UNITED KINGDOM TEMPERANCE AND GENERAL PROVIDENT INSTITUTION;”

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE HAHNEMANN ACADEMY OF NEW YORK;

ONE OF THE EDITORS OF “THE ORGANON,”

AND AUTHOR OF

“A COMPLETE REPERTORY TO THE HOMŒOPATHIC MATERIA MEDICA, VOL. 1. EYES.”)

“THE TRICK AND TWO BY HONOURS,” SAID PROSERPINE. “PRAY, MY DEAR TIRESIAS, YOU WHO ARE SUCH A FINE PLAYER, HOW CAME YOU TO TRUMP MY BEST CARD?”

“BECAUSE I WANTED TO LEAD. AND THOSE WHO WANT TO LEAD, PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY, MUST NEVER HESITATE ABOUT SACRIFICING THEIR FRIENDS.” (*The Infernal Marriage*. BY THE RIGHT HON. B. DISRAELI.)

LIVERPOOL: / 14

ADAM HOLDEN, 48, CHURCH STREET.

1879.

Price Two Shillings. Sent post free on receipt of price.



# HOMŒOPATHY VINDICATED:

## A REPLY

TO

DR. JOSEPH KIDD'S

“LAWS OF THERAPEUTICS.”

BY

E. W. BERRIDGE, M.D.

(MEDICAL REFEREE TO THE “UNITED KINGDOM TEMPERANCE AND GENERAL PROVIDENT  
INSTITUTION;”  
CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE HAHNEMANN ACADEMY OF NEW YORK;  
ONE OF THE EDITORS OF “THE ORGANON;”  
AND AUTHOR OF  
“A COMPLETE REPERTORY TO THE HOMŒOPATHIC MATERIA MEDICA, VOL. I. EYES.”)

“THE TRICK AND TWO BY HONOURS,” SAID PROSERPINE. “PRAY, MY DEAR TIRESIAS, YOU WHO ARE SUCH A FINE PLAYER, HOW CAME YOU TO TRUMP MY BEST CARD?”

“BECAUSE I WANTED TO LEAD. AND THOSE WHO WANT TO LEAD, PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY, MUST NEVER HESITATE ABOUT SACRIFICING THEIR FRIENDS.” (*The Infernal Marriage.* BY THE RIGHT HON. B. DISRAELI.)

LIVERPOOL:  
ADAM HOLDEN, 48, CHURCH STREET.

1879.

*Price Two Shillings. Sent post free on receipt of price.*





# HOMŒOPATHY VINDICATED:

## A REPLY

TO

DR. JOSEPH KIDD'S "LAWS OF THERAPEUTICS."

---

"LAWS of Therapeutics" has an imposing sound. Like HAHNEMANN'S masterpiece, the *Organon of Medicine*, a work so significantly entitled claims to be more than a mere treatise on the Healing-Art; it claims first that there *are* Laws of Therapeutics, and secondly, that the writer, being thoroughly conversant with them, undertakes to unfold them to his readers. Such a work will necessarily arrest the attention of both the current schools of medicine; of the Allopathic School, because they confess with sorrow that they have no laws by which they can be guided in their treatment of the sick, therefore naturally desire to know them, should they exist; and of the Homœopathic School, because the laws by which they are guided have been already enunciated by HAHNEMANN, so that they with equal reason desire to know whether the object of this new work is to uphold and amplify, or to confute them; and, in the latter case, what arguments drawn from actual experience can be adduced.

As an explanatory preamble, Dr. Kidd says, "In the following pages I desire to make a fresh and unbiassed inquiry into the fundamental principles of the Science and Art of Healing, to ascertain if medicine can be brought into the position of an exact Science, or if it is to remain merely an Art. I have endeavoured to forget men and their systems, and to search for truth—for all truth. The true student of nature ever delights to lay self aside, to present his offering to the growth of knowledge and withdraw, that God and His truth may be all in all." Truly a most worthy

and noble aim! Let us see how far the author carries his ideal conception into reality.

“The most pressing question at the present time for the physician to ascertain,” continues Dr. Kidd, “is whether the treatment of disease is to depend on mere opinion, which varies with each doctor and perishes with the individual, or on laws which, founded on the immutable truth of facts, can never perish, but must endure through all ages.” With this in view, he first gives a historical sketch of medicine, extending from the Egyptian darkness of past ages to the most modern discoveries of the nineteenth century, of course taking HAHNEMANN *en route*. This sketch is by no means complete, or even accurate. Not only is there no mention of the ancient Hindoo medicine, a system which presents many features of interest, but we find serious errors, not of omission but of commission. After touching on the medicine of Egypt, Persia, Greece, Babylon, and Assyria, our author passes to the celebrated Aselepiadæ, and thence by natural transition to Hippocrates. And here we find, almost at the threshold, how completely Dr. Kidd has mistaken his vocation in assuming the *role* of the historian of medicine. He informs us (p. 56) that “Galen’s doctrines differed little from Hippocrates’, except in their sharply defined character and fierceness.” Hippocrates—the “Father of Medicine,” the “Divine Old Man of Cos,” one of the first, if not *the* first, who enunciated the law of Similars as a primary law of healing, whose “Aphorisms” were deemed by Bœnninghausen himself worthy of translation and commentary—classed with Galen, the defender of the law of Contraries, the supporter of the absurdities of polypharmacy, the coward who deserted his post for fear of the plague! Hyperion to a satyr! This alone should make us cautious how far we accept without inquiry Dr. Kidd’s further statements, especially those relating to HAHNEMANN. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

Passing over a few Schools, we arrive at “the sect of the Eclectics, professing to select the good and avoid the bad in all the systems of the Empirics, Dogmatists, Methodists, &c.” Of this School he says, “Of all the ‘sects,’ that of the Eclectics was about the worst. *Eclecticism in medicine is like the mule in creation, essentially barren.*” [Note. Italics our own, as elsewhere where we desire to

draw special attention.] This is a remarkable acknowledgment, and that one who acknowledges its truth should still persist in Eclecticism himself—for Dr. Kidd's practice, as here recorded, being neither Homœopathic nor Allopathic exclusively, fairly comes under this title—is also remarkable; perhaps, however, it may be accounted for by another zoological fact, viz., that the mule is not only "essentially barren," but essentially *stupid*, an unfortunate quality derived from its asinine progenitor.

After touching on the sect of the Sceptics, whom he seems to have mentioned for no other purpose than to drag in a little theology, he arrives at Galen, whose application of the law of Contraries, he tells us, was based upon the mere "opinion of the nature of disease and of the nature of drug action." His comments on this opinion-basis are excellent. "This substitution," he says, "of the doctor's opinion for the exact observation of facts has been the cause of the barren state of therapeutics since his time to the present age. It has borne bad fruit to science, having caused physicians for many centuries to neglect the observation of the actual phenomena of disease, and to substitute theory or opinion. To the present hour this is the deadly gap in the science of medicine. The action of each medicine on the healthy body is little understood; such knowledge is confused. The little that is known is muddled by the opinions of such and such a doctor that it is 'alterative' or 'sedative,' or some other word that only serves to confuse knowledge." A very true picture indeed of the darkness of the Old School; but where do we find perfect freedom from such speculations? Where do we find that the action of medicines is well understood from the study of accurate records of their pathogeneses, into which no mere opinion or theory as to their action is allowed to enter? We find it in the true Homœopathic School as founded by HAHNEMANN, and *nowhere else*. Even the adherents of the modern hybrid School, who delight to call themselves, not Homœopathic Physicians, but "Physicians practising Homœopathy," have fallen, and continue ever to fall deeper and deeper, into that very error which their leader here denounces, and talk learnedly of "adenoid depressants," "depression of the semilunar ganglion of the great sympathetic nerve," and the like vague phrases borrowed from



that School which they fondly dream they have for ever left; till at last we find even the lecturer on *Materia Medica* at the new London School of "Homœopathy" (in which School Dr. Kidd holds an important position) asserting (*United States Medical Investigator*, November, 1876, p. 408) that to treat a disease *pathologically*, *i.e.*, according to the *theory* the doctor may have about its nature, and the nature of the action of the drug he prescribes, is better than to treat each case *symptomatically*, *i.e.*, to give that medicine whose *ascertained* symptoms agree most completely with the *ascertained* symptoms of the individual patient. After such progress backwards from the doctrines of HAHNEMANN, is it to be wondered at that the same lecturer tells his class at the above-mentioned School, that though the curative effect of *Salicylic Acid* in rheumatism could not be claimed "as an instance of the operation of the law of similars" (which, by the way, is an error), we should not be "justified in abstaining from the use of this remedy in the cases suitable (!) for it?"

Separated only by a few minor Schools, we come to that of the "Chemical Physicians," which affords Dr. Kidd the opportunity of adding one more to the many slanders heaped upon Paracelsus, by calling him "a man of the most consummate audacity and presumption." We need not again refute this charge; his character has been fully vindicated by others. Neither need we now dwell on the other pre- or post-Hahnemannian Schools; our object is the vindication of HAHNEMANN'S Homœopathy, and we have touched thus briefly upon some of the earlier Schools by way of deducing a few lessons, and also testing Dr. Kidd's accuracy. We will, therefore, at once plunge *in medias res*, and ascertain whether our author's estimate of HAHNEMANN is free from those errors into which he has fallen with regard to some of his predecessors.

"The genius of Haller," commences Dr. Kidd, "gave its impetus to the mind of HAHNEMANN, who laboured for many years to elucidate the physiological action of medicinal agents, often with artificial and exaggerated minuteness. His great enthusiasm led him to reject *in toto* all that savoured of Galen; caused him to ascribe too much power to medicinal substances, and to impute too little to the practical management of the patient's habits, diet, exercise, baths, external applications, choice of climate, soil, and



situation." Here, at the very first, we find a slander against our Master. What *proof* has Dr. Kidd that HAHNEMANN was guilty of an "artificial and exaggerated minuteness" in his provings of medicines? Will he condescend to inform us how minuteness of detail in a scientific experiment can be either "artificial" or "exaggerated?" Does he mean to tell scientific men that any detail in science can be too minute? Certainly no one will ever accuse Dr. Kidd of having fallen into the supposed error with which he charges HAHNEMANN, for *his* cases, as detailed in this book, are often so vaguely given that it is impossible to draw any definite conclusion from them, except, indeed, that Dr. Kidd made a wonderful cure, often after somebody else had failed, which perhaps, however, is the very conclusion he wished his readers to arrive at. Dr. Kidd, as a *professed* Homœopathic physician, ought to know that Homœopathy requires the utmost minuteness of detail and individualization; and that symptoms *apparently* insignificant, and, to the pathologist, utterly inexplicable, often decide the choice between two or more allied remedies—a choice which makes all the difference between a tedious and a rapid cure. But to carry this into actual every-day practice requires hard work, patience, and an earnest—often very arduous—search into the Repertories and Materia Medica, even in the presence of the patient. This is too laborious for some who are lazy; too *infra dig.* for others who desire to play the part of the fashionable physician, and, trading upon a previously acquired reputation, profess to their deluded dupes that they can "see their case at a glance," allotting to the investigation of their condition a brief modicum of time, equivalent to about three minutes *per corpus vile*. It has its reward, however.

*Apropos* of this matter we will make the following quotation from HAHNEMANN'S *Organon* (section 149, note):—"But this *laborious, sometimes very laborious, search* for and selection of the homœopathic remedy *most suitable in every respect* to each morbid state, is an operation which, notwithstanding all the laudable books for facilitating it, still demands the study of the original sources themselves, and at the same time *a great amount of circumspection and serious deliberation*, which have their best reward in the consciousness of having faithfully discharged our

duty. How could this laborious careful task, *which alone can render possible the most effectual cure of diseases*, please the gentlemen belonging to the NEW MONGREL SECT,\* who assume the honourable name of Homœopathists, and even *seem to employ medicines in form and appearance homœopathic*, but used by them *without the slightest deliberation* (*quidquid in buccam renit*), and who, when the unsuitable remedy does not immediately give relief,

\* The following excellent definition and illustration of this term is from the pen of our esteemed colleague, Dr. Skinner:—"As there are some parties, both in and out of the profession of medicine, who have a difficulty in grasping the meaning of the term "Mongrel," as applied to a sect, or who think the term undignified to apply to any body of intelligent men, let us explain. The term means one of a mixed breed, a hybrid, and is applied to the lower animals. It also signifies, or is analogous to, the terms half-and-half, linsey-woolsey, heterogeneous, composite; in short, "mixed goods," neither one thing nor another, all things to all men, having no mind of their own, neither hot nor cold, but lukewarm. If there is one expression here which does not faithfully describe the mongrel in medicine, religion, morals, or aught else, we are greatly mistaken. A "mongrel," in our estimation, is anyone who practises two systems, Homœopathy and Allopathy, as if the one were as good as the other, or at all compatible, when they are the very antipodes of each other, or diametrical opposites. A single sedative, opiate, tonic, purge or diaphoretic, will prevent the true therapeutic action of the best selected dynamized medicine for hours, if not for days; and this is one of the curses of having now and again to meet a "mongrel" physician in consultation, who may, before our arrival, have given *forty-five grains of Chloral* to relieve pain and induce sleep, for the ninth night in succession. A fact! Here is another from the pen of a leading homœopathic (?) physician in one of our largest provincial towns, and we give it *verbatim et literatim* from his own handwriting, the prescriptions being in our possession. The patient, a gentleman, fell and received a blow on the perineum, injuring the urethra in so far as to cause blood to flow freely from it. By rest and cold *Arnica* lotions this was relieved, but a blenorrhœa of *clear prostatic fluid* set in, and proved obstinate. Mongrels are continually meeting with "obstinate" cases; that is, cases which *they* cannot cure with infinitesimals, and this state of matters, they think, justifies the following orthodox treatment. "August 20th, 1878. R—*Thuja* A 3 ij. Take four drops thrice daily in a tablespoonful of water. R—*Merc. Dulcis* A gr. ij., six powders each. Take one at noon every second day. R—*Zinci Chloridi* gr. ij.; *Aquæ Destillatæ* 3 iv. Solve. The injection to be used two or three times a day." Here follow the initials of the "physician practising Homœopathy." The above is not bad for one visit. The gentleman being himself well versed in the works of HAHNEMANN, was greatly astonished at receiving a syringe and injection from a leading homœopathic physician, and, *knowing better than the doctor*, he declined to use it. The *Thuja* and the *Calomel* had no more effect than so much water on a duck's back, so he returned to the "physician practising Homœopathy!" Here is his second prescription. "3rd September, 1878. R—*Cannabis* 6 3 j. *Sp. vini*. 3 iij. Dose, four drops night and morning. R—*Ol. Santalin* Capsules X. Take one capsule at noon, and the drops night and morning daily." Here follow the same initials. The patient did not take the capsules, "*because he knew that they were not dynamized; at all events, they smelt strongly and looked*

in place of laying the blame on their unpardonable indolence and laxity in performing the most important and serious of all human affairs, ascribe it to homœopathy, which they accuse of great imperfection (if the truth be told, its imperfection consists in this, that the most suitable homœopathic remedy for each morbid condition does not spontaneously fly into their mouths like roasted pigeons, without any trouble on their own part)? They know, however, from frequent practice, how to make up for the inefficiency of the scarcely half homœopathic remedy, by the employment of allopathic means, *that come much more handy to them*, among which one or more dozens of leeches applied to the affected part, or little harmless venesections to the extent of eight ounces, and so forth, act an important figure; and should the patient, in spite of all this, recover, they extol their venesections, leeches, &c., alleging that had it not been for these, the patient would not have been brought through, and they give us to understand, in no doubtful language, that these operations, devised *without much exercise of genius*, from the pernicious routine of the Old School, in reality contributed the best share towards the cure; but if the patient die under the treatment, *as not unfrequently happens*, they seek to console the friends by saying that they themselves were

*unhomœopathic*." Again no good resulted. From beginning to end, with the exception of the *Thuya*, there was not a medicine prescribed corresponding to the patient. He was cured in a week or two with *Natrum-m.* 30 and C m (F.C.), followed by one dose of *Thuya* 50 m (F.C.). This "physician practising Homœopathy" is one of the most active in the camp of those followers of HAHNEMANN (?) in moving heaven and earth for a restoration to the flesh-pots of Egypt, which he should never have left. His knowledge of HAHNEMANN and Homœopathy is painfully and deplorably small, yet he really believes that no man on earth is at all to approach him in Hahnemannian lore. The outside world wonders why we snub such shallow pretenders, and call them "mongrels!" As regards the choiceness or elegance of the word "mongrel," we confess that it is anything but complimentary or elegant; but, when compliment is not only not meant, but the reverse, and when elegance of diction would be out of place, one is more than satisfied with the truthfulness of the expression by the forcible manner in which it hits those minds for whom it was meant—those whom the cap fits! The term can offend no one except those and their sympathisers! If we may be allowed, in speaking of such men, to copy the example and use the language of the Sacred Scriptures as regards religious truth, we should remind those of mock refinement of the text—"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."—Rev. iii. 15, 16. The text may be inelegantly expressed, but it expresses the meaning of the term "mongrel," and the feeling that HAHNEMANN had, and which we have towards them as a body."

witnesses that everything conceivable had been done for the lamented deceased. Who would do this *frivolous and pernicious* tribe the honour to call them after the name of the very laborious but salutary art, HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIANS? *May the just recompense await them, that when taken ill they may be treated in the same manner!*" How true those words of HAHNEMANN are, even to the concluding sentence, let recent history tell!

But *revenons à nos moutons*. Dr. Kidd maintains that HAHNEMANN "imputed too little to the practical management of the patient's habits," &c. We wonder if he *ever* read HAHNEMANN'S works. If he has not, his condemnation of him will be taken at its true value; if he has, how dare he thus ignore the fact that several pages of the *Organon* and *Chronic Diseases* are devoted to these very subjects?

Dr. Kidd continues, "Gradually he began to lessen the amount of dose, *not by any logical deduction from facts, but rather from an arbitrary conceit of his own fancy*, till he broached the mystical doctrine of infinitesimal doses and of dynamization. The *grand mistake* of HAHNEMANN was *not to have rested in the promulgation of the primary Law of Therapeutics*. In forsaking the accurate interpretation of facts, he became a 'system-builder,' like Galen or Boerhaave,—*essentially a dogmatist, i.e., one whose influence as a teacher depended largely upon the acceptance of his fundamental doctrines or dogmata as regards the nature of disease, its causes, and its cure.*"

Will Dr. Kidd give us any good reason why HAHNEMANN should have "rested in the promulgation of the primary Law of Therapeutics," if there were any other law, secondary it may be, but yet correlative, to be discovered? That Dr. Kidd has not "rested" there is shown in this very compilation of his, where he openly advocates the law of contraries! HAHNEMANN a "dogmatist!" Had his maligner been as well acquainted with his writings as he seems to be with those of the Allopathic school, he would never have penned such a statement. Is it "dogmatism" to challenge the entire profession to put his statements to the practical test, and refute them if possible? HAHNEMANN reduce the dose "not by any logical deduction from facts, but rather from an arbitrary conceit of his own fancy!" We wonder



whether this was the reason why Dr. Kidd proceeded in the opposite direction from infinitesimal to large doses. Did he never read what HAHNEMANN himself wrote on this subject? Even in *his very first work on Homœopathy*, published in 1796 (*Versuch über ein neuss Princep zur Auffindung der Heilkräfte der Arzneisubstanzen, &c.*), he says, “If we mean to go to work little by little, as the cautious physician should do, we must give this ordinary remedy *ONLY in such a dose*, as to *almost imperceptibly* show the artificial disease to be expected from it (it still acts after all by virtue of its tendency to excite such an artificial disease), and go up in the dose by degrees as to be certain that the internal change of the bodily system ensues forcefully enough, although with manifestations *in violence far behind* the natural symptoms of disease. Thus we shall cure gently and surely.” Further on, in the same work, he says, “The dose was *much too strong* for her. By this it explains itself why *Chamomilla* is found to be so helpful in after-pains, in too great a mobility of the fibre, and in hysteria, *IF* employed in *doses in which it cannot itself perceptibly excite the like*, therefore, *in far lesser ones* than the one mentioned.” Again, speaking of *Arnica* root, he says, “Here, in order to become helpful, in diarrhœas without pus, it must be administered *ONLY in so little doses* that it does not manifestly purge. From the abuse of an infusion of *Arnica* flowers I saw glandular swellings arise. I should err very much if *with more moderate doses* it would not cure similar swellings.” Does Dr. Kidd want any more proof that the minimum dose was an integral part of Homœopathy *from the very first*? What the minimum dose was had to be determined; and if Dr. Kidd had only traced this subject through HAHNEMANN’S writings, he would have seen how cautiously this great man went to work, publishing his experience from time to time, till at last he discovered that by his process of dilution and succussion not only were the injurious effects of the ordinary Allopathic doses avoided, but that new curative and even pathogenetic properties were developed. Dr. Kidd may sneer at the doctrine of dynamization,\*

\* On this subject we refer the reader to Dr. Burnett’s recently published book, “*Natrum Muriatricum*, as Test of the Doctrine of Drug-Dynamization.” Dr Kidd must be endowed with the most sublime self-conceit if he does not have a *mauvais quart d’heure* when he peruses it.

well-known even to the earliest of the alchemists, as “mystical” and “whimsical;” the Laws of Nature do not rest on his *dictum* or “opinion;” and such puny attempts to refute an established fact merely because he does not comprehend it, remind one of the grand lines addressed by Carlyle to one who endeavoured to fetter free thought:—

The Builder of this universe was wise;  
He made all things, all systems, planets, particles;  
The plan he formed his worlds and æons by  
Was—Heavens! was thy small nine and thirty articles?

Dr. Kidd continues:—“The tendency of the present age is to mistrust the ‘systems’ of medicine which rely upon doctrines or dogmata; to rely altogether on the accurate facts of experience searched out by the most perfect methods of investigation, proved at the bedside of the sick.” But is not this exactly what HAHNEMANN did? To quote the words of Carroll Dunham:—“Our colleague appeals to collections of ‘facts.’ Is not HAHNEMANN’S statement of his practical conclusions a most stupendous collection of facts? Who ever observed so many of them? Who ever observed so well as he? Facts must be received on testimony; who ever reported more graphically and more faithfully than HAHNEMANN? If we doubt his ability, his capacity, his candour, what are we doing with his *Materia Medica*, on the truth of which we risk our patients’ lives? This outcry against ‘swearing in the words of the master’ has come to have a very different meaning from that of the ancient original protest. It was never meant to intimate that the opinion and testimony of him whose abilities had crowned him ‘king of men’ should not have a royal weight of influence.”

Dr. Kidd now quotes HAHNEMANN—as a certain unmentionable and underground potentate is said to have once quoted Scripture—for his own ends; and like the aforesaid sable gentleman he quotes *imperfectly*. He says, “With all his vast practice, it is singular that HAHNEMANN published the records of but two cases, one of which was a model of accurate description—a case of gastralgia, for which he prescribed the strongest or mother tincture of *Bryonia*, which effectually cured the disease in a few days.” We will here say, *en passant*, (1) that if Dr. Kidd admits that HAHNEMANN had



a "vast practice," it is simply an act of supreme folly for him to dismiss as "whimsical" the conclusions which he based there-upon; (2) that these two cases were *not* the only two which HAHNEMANN ever published; (3) that if the *Bryonia* case was such a "model of accurate description," it is to be regretted that Dr. Kidd has not followed suit; and (4), that if HAHNEMANN gave but ONE DROP DOSE of *Bryonia* without repetition (as we find he did, though Dr. Kidd omits to mention it), with such excellent results, how is it that the latter finds it necessary to give *repeated and larger doses*? But to resume. After quoting the case, Dr. Kidd continues, "This use of strong tinctures may be called the practice of his mature manhood, so unlike the whimsical speculations of his old age;" a remark which he no doubt thinks conclusive, and likely to prove a strong auxiliary argument for his friend and admirer, the *teacher* of "Homœopathy," who lately announced, in opposition to all evidence, that HAHNEMANN'S latest teachings were those of his "Senility."

There is a good story told of the French Academicians. In the compilation of their Dictionary, they defined a crab as "a red fish which walks backwards." Desirous, however, of being quite accurate on so important a point, they sent a deputation to Cuvier to ask if their definition met with his approbation. "Gentlemen," said Cuvier, "your description is excellent; the crab-eaters—and they are a numerous body—will not fail to recognise it." The deputation were retiring in delight, when Cuvier called one of them back, and whispered in his ear, "Between ourselves, a crab is not red, it is not a fish, and it does not walk backwards; with these exceptions your definition is perfect." Dr. Kidd's argument is likewise very good, but it has the unfortunate demerit of being completely inaccurate. Here is the proof:—

(1) Dr. Kidd *omits* to quote (why?) HAHNEMANN'S second case, quite as much a "model of accurate description" as the former, and cured by one dose of the 12TH potency of *Pulsatilla*.

(2) Dr. Kidd *omits* (why?) HAHNEMANN'S note to the effect that "the latest improvements of our healing-art" had shown that the 30th potency would have been still better; adding, "therefore my administration of a drop of the crude tincture to a

robust woman, as in the above case, should not serve by any means as a recommendation for imitation."

(3) Dr. Kidd utterly disregards the fact (why?) that so far from "this use of strong tinctures" being "the practice of his mature manhood," his use of infinitesimals commenced as early as 1799, *only three years after the publication of his first paper on Homœopathy*; and that, in the years 1814-16, within which time he treated these two cases, he particularly mentioned the use, not only of the strong tincture, but also of the 1st, 8th, 9th, 12th, 15th, 18th, and 30th potencies.

Dr. Kidd's next slander is still more atrocious; it is no longer a sin of omission, it is one of commission, and he does not hesitate to charge the Master with something very much like trifling with the lives of his patients. He says, "When cholera invaded Europe in 1831, HAHNEMANN prescribed *Camphor* IN LARGE DOSES [Dr. Kidd himself italicizes these words] frequently repeated; at the time, too, when he was full of his idea of infinitesimal doses, *which he recognised were not potent enough* to grapple with that terrible disease. *Refusing to extend his own experience of that disease to others nearly as deadly, he insisted upon ignoring the facts of experience* to promulgate the whimsical notion of dynamization, *begotten not of careful experience, but of fanciful dogmatism, which denounced in harsh terms all who differed from him.*"

Seldom have we met with a more outrageous perversion of facts, and had we not known its source we could not have believed that it could have emanated from anyone who had ever assumed the name of Homœopath. We will minutely analyze this statement:—

(1) Dr. Kidd does not attempt to define (perhaps wisely) what "large doses" of *Camphor* are; so we will refer to the records of medicine. In 1798 HAHNEMANN spoke of giving from THIRTY TO FORTY GRAINS of *Camphor* in certain fevers. Dr. Rubini, in a paper published in the *Annals of the British Homœopathic Society*, 1865, p. 289, recommends in cholera the administration of FIVE drops of a SATURATED solution of *Camphor* (in the proportions of equal weights of *Camphor* and *Alcohol*) every fifteen minutes. In the *Hahnemannian Monthly*, vol. xi., p. 575, we find that some cases of cholera treated by Rubini received as much as from TWO TO EIGHT POUNDS of SATURATED tincture of *Camphor*; in one case THIRTY DROPS

being given internally every five minutes. This gives us a very fair idea of what "large doses" of *Camphor* are. Now, let us turn to HAHNEMANN. In his paper on the "Cure and Prevention of Asiatic Cholera," published in *Archiv. f. Hom. Heilkunde*, 1831, vol. xi., we read as follows:—"In the first stage, accordingly, the patient must get as often as possible (at least every five minutes) A DROP\* of spirit of *Camphor* (made with one ounce of *Camphor* to twelve of *Alcohol*) on a lump of sugar or in a spoonful of water. Some spirit of *Camphor* must be taken in the hollow of the hand and rubbed into the skin of the arms, legs, and chest of the patient; he may also get a clyster of half a pint of warm water, mingled with two full teaspoonsful of spirit of *Camphor*, and from time to time some *Camphor* may be allowed to evaporate on a hot iron, so that if the mouth should be closed by trismus, and he can swallow nothing, he may draw in enough of *Camphor* vapour with his breath." And in a note, "There were cases of patients for whom *Camphor* had not been employed, who had apparently died in the first stage, and were laid out for dead, in whom a finger was seen to move; in these, some *Camphor* spirit mixed with oil, and introduced into the mouth, recalled the apparently dead again to life." Such was HAHNEMANN'S teaching in 1831, and in the face of this Dr. Kidd dares to say that he then advocated "large doses." We may mention here, that in 1833 HAHNEMANN still further reduced the dose, and recommended (*Organon*, 246, note) only "one or two drops of a weak solution of *Camphor*" every five minutes.

(2) Dr. Kidd's barefaced assertion that HAHNEMANN at this period, though "full of his idea of infinitesimal doses," recognised them as "not potent enough to grapple with that terrible disease," is in direct contradiction to HAHNEMANN'S express injunction in the above-named treatise of 1831, that in the after stage of cholera, *Cuprum*, *Veratrum*, and other medicines, were to be given, according to the symptoms, IN THE 30TH POTENCY!!!

Perhaps Dr. Kidd would like to know *why* HAHNEMANN recommended *Camphor* in larger doses than the other remedies, his own

\* Reckoning the somewhat vague quantity, "a drop," as equivalent to a minim, one drop of this solution would contain only ONE-TWELFTH OF A GRAIN of pure *Camphor*! What an enormous dose! No wonder Dr. Kidd is shocked.

“opinion” on the matter having proved untenable. Evidently because it was *possible* that so volatile a substance as *Camphor* might evaporate in the process of dilution; hence it was more prudent to *commence* with the tincture in a disease so rapid as to leave no time to repair an accident. Possibly Dr. Kidd may be pleased to learn that this natural and justifiable suspicion has proved to be unfounded, and that “later experience has proved satisfactorily that the potencies of this volatile substance *act more rapidly and with greater energy* than the unpotentized tincture. In the cholera epidemic of 1832, *the greatest success* has followed the administration of the 30TH POTENCY of *Camphor*, by one of our oldest physicians in New York.” (Dr. Ad. Lippe’s *Lecture on Cholera*, p. 21.) In the last cholera epidemic in England, the late Dr. William Ray had splendid success with the 200th potency.

Dr. Kidd now comes out with a fine flourish! “Truth is greater than HAHNEMANN,” he exultingly exclaims, “and of late years his speculations about ‘Psora’ and ‘infinitesimal doses’ have been tacitly given up by all the most skilful and intelligent of his followers.” Truth is greater than HAHNEMANN! Necessarily so; for all truth is a revelation from God, who is the Absolute Truth, and the truth which is revealed must always be greater than the mere inspired instrument who is the medium of the revelation. But did it never occur to our author, that if truth is greater than HAHNEMANN, *a fortiori*, it must be infinitely greater than KIDD? We know that HAHNEMANN was raised up in the Divine Providence to gather up the fragments of old therapeutic truths, develop them, unite them in one harmonious whole, and give them to the world for the relief of suffering humanity; what Dr. Kidd has been specially raised up for we have not yet been able to discover, unless it was to attend a distinguished statesman at the late Berlin Congress, and so aid in the settlement of the Eastern Question!

But Dr. Kidd asserts that “of late years his speculations about ‘Psora’ and ‘infinitesimal doses’ have been tacitly given up by all the most skilful and intelligent of his followers.” HAHNEMANN said, even as early as 1820, “I HOLD NONE TO BE MY FOLLOWER, who, besides an irreproachable truly moral conduct, does not exercise the new art at least in such a manner, that his remedy given



to the patient contains in an unmedicinal vehicle (sugar of milk or watered alcohol) the medicine *in such a little fine dose*, that neither the senses nor chemical analysis could discover in it the least absolutely injurious medicament, even not at all the least properly medicinal thing." We are therefore at a loss to comprehend how any one can be a "follower," least of all a "skilful and intelligent follower," of HAHNEMANN, and yet repudiate, either "tacitly" or otherwise, one of his most important doctrines; and we shall feel obliged to Dr. Kidd if he will kindly extricate us from our present state of bewilderment. In the meanwhile we will ask him whether it was merely ignorance of the facts of the case, or a conceited idea that only HE and HIS followers could be called "the most skilful and intelligent," which made him give utterance to the above statement, and thereby offer a wanton and gratuitous insult to a number of earnest, thoughtful, and conscientious men.

"Skilful and intelligent!" Does he refuse these terms to the early disciples of HAHNEMANN, men like Bœnninghausen, Stapf, Gross, Jahr, and others, by whose enthusiasm and faithful labours Homœopathy was maintained and so widely extended? "Skilful and intelligent!" Does he not know that it is to the true Hahnemannians that the profession at large is indebted for the most reliable *Materia Medica*s, the most complete Repertories, the most minute illustrations of the practical application of Homœopathy that the world has ever seen; and that it is to the mongrels, the eclectics, the half-homœopaths, the "physicians practising Homœopathy," that we are indebted(?) for all the scissors-and-paste books which now abound, the caricatures of a *Materia Medica*, with their imperfect Repertories, and, in short, all the sickening amount of illiterate rubbish which their ally the "shop" annually vomits forth? "Skilful and intelligent!" Will he deny these titles to such veterans in Homœopathy as Drs. D. Wilson, of England, Ad. Lippe, C. Hering, P. P. Wells, &c., of America, men who to this very day are not only firm adherents of HAHNEMANN, but are actively engaged in spreading a knowledge of his doctrines? If he does, let him give *proofs* of the superiority of himself and his followers; let him publish *but one* monograph of a medicine equal to C. Hering's monographs

of *Lachesis*, *Apis*, &c., or a Repertory of *only one* division of the body equal to the Repertories of Jahr and Bœnninghausen; and especially let him give statistics showing that he and his adherents can make better cures!

To facilitate the desired comparison, we will give some statistics, vouched for by Dr. Ad. Lippe, of Philadelphia:—

- (1.) “In 1859 there were treated by myself in the town of Carlisle, Pa., over 150 cases of scarlet fever with the 200th and higher potencies exclusively; MORTALITY NONE: the Allopaths lost over 90 per cent., and the survivors were crippled for life.” (*Cincinnati Medical Advance*, 1876, vol. 3, p. 544.)
- (2.) “I have attended cholera patients; NEVER LOST ONE.” (*American Homœopathic Review*, 1864, vol. 5, p. 162.)
- (3.) “It was our duty to attend, some five years ago, a very large number of cases of malignant small-pox, then raging as an epidemic in this city. Many prominent persons came under our care; we never made any external application; came out of the epidemic with flying colours, NOT A CASE PITTED.” (*Homœopathic Times*, 1877, vol. v, p. 187.)

What does Dr. Kidd say to these statistics? If he denies that Dr. Ad. Lippe is one of the “most skilful and intelligent” of HAHNEMANN’S followers, let him show that he can do better himself. We ask nothing unreasonable. Dr. Lippe is a representative of Homœopathy, and we would not compare with his splendid success the failures of a mere tyro; but Dr. Kidd is also a representative, nay, the chief representative of—well, let us call it *Kiddopathy*—and, as such, must hold his own or throw up the sponge.

So much for the infinitesimal dose. Let us now see if he is any more accurate about the doctrine of Psora, which he stigmatizes as a “speculation,” and “just as baseless as any of the many theories which he helped to overthrow.” Dr. Kidd does not attempt to *describe* Psora; he presupposes that his readers know perfectly well what the term means. But, as it happens, there is scarcely any HAHNEMANNIC doctrine (not *theory*, as Dr. Kidd calls



it) which has been so misunderstood, both by friends and foes, and we very much doubt if Dr. Kidd understands it himself. The usual idea seems to be, that HAHNEMANN attributed the great majority of cases of chronic disease to suppressed *itch*, from which idea his enemies try to make capital, some by endeavouring to disgust their patients with Homœopathy, and others by triumphantly pointing to the *Acarus scabiei* (with whose existence HAHNEMANN was perfectly acquainted, though it suits the tactics of his maligners to deny it) as the *cause* of the disease, imagining in their shortsightedness that they can therefore overthrow the doctrine of Psora, and with it Homœopathy itself!

It is to the fount of Homœopathic knowledge that we must go for explanation on such a disputed point, not to the stream made turbid by the hoofs of every ass that tries to quench his thirst therein. What does HAHNEMANN say about Psora? HAHNEMANN, as every student of his writings knows, divided chronic disease into three generic (not specific) classes. This threefold division was merely for convenience, and as a further guide in the treatment of complex cases; had he left it as a unit, or still further subdivided it, the *essential* nature of his doctrine would have remained unaltered. Of the genus Psora (and his words are applicable to the other classes also) he says:—"I observed that the chronic diseases, even after having been repeatedly and successfully removed by the then-known homœopathic remedies, continually re-appeared in a more or less modified form, and with a yearly increase of disagreeable symptoms. This proved to me the fact that the phenomena which appeared to constitute the ostensible disease ought not to be regarded as the whole boundaries of the disease—otherwise the disease would have been completely and permanently cured by homœopathic drugs, which was not the case,—but that this ostensible disease was a mere fragment of a much more deeply-seated primitive evil, the great extent of which might be inferred from the new symptoms which continued to appear from time to time. This showed me that the homœopathic practitioner ought not to treat diseases of this kind as separate or completely developed maladies, nor that he ought to expect such a permanent cure of these diseases as would prevent them from appearing again in the system, either in their original or in a modified and often more disagreeable

form. I became convinced that the first condition of finding out one or more homœopathic medicines *which should cover ALL THE SYMPTOMS characterising THE WHOLE disturbance*, was to discover all the ailments and symptoms inherent in the unknown primitive malady. The medicines being found out, the physician would then be able to conquer and completely to extinguish THE WHOLE disease, together with its successively appearing group of symptoms." HAHNEMANN'S treatment of chronic disease, then, was simply this: to select a remedy which should be homœopathic, not only to the present, but to the past symptoms; in a word, to the entire constitutional state of the patient.

Moreover, as if to guard his teaching from all possibility of misconception, he further says:—"This *internal* enemy I shall designate by the *general* term Psora. It is an *internal* disease, a sort of *internal* itch, and may exist *with or without an eruption* upon the skin." Again, even when referring to the *external* manifestations of Psora, he speaks of "*vestiges of the itch*" showing themselves in the shape of "*small pustules or herpes*." Again, he speaks of *leprosy* and *malignant erysipelas* as ancient forms of Psora. Lastly he says:—"These means, together with an increasing refinement and more select nourishment, succeeded in a couple of centuries in diminishing the disgusting appearance of Psora, so as to reduce the disease towards the end of the 15th century to the ordinary eruption of the itch." We might quote other passages, but these will suffice to show to all whom self-importance has not rendered incurably blind and prejudiced, that by "Psora" HAHNEMANN meant a chronic dyscrasia, or "*miasm*" as he terms it, of which the itch was only *one* of the external manifestations, though at his time, and a little previously, the most frequent.

We have expressed our doubts as to whether Dr. Kidd really understands what HAHNEMANN meant by Psora, and we purpose now to prove from his own words that he does not. At p. 116 he gives a case of paralysis following the removal of a nasal polypus, and consequent suppression of the former copious discharge. At p. 120 he says:—"A dissimilar action may suspend a disease for a time, but seldom cures permanently. I have observed epilepsy to be arrested in two cases by the occurrence of porrigo. As soon as the latter was cured, the epilepsy returned as badly as ever. If

mania occur in a consumptive patient, the lung symptoms are often arrested till the mania passes off, when they return with increased force." At p. 166 he mentions a case in which little patches were observed on the os uteri like psoriasis of the tongue. Under treatment, psoriasis appeared on her arms, the uterine distress passing away; the patient's father having had psoriasis on the arm for twenty-five years. At p. 185 he says:—"Eczema of the skin in children—a natural counter-irritation—frequently relieves catarrh of the bronchial mucous membrane. The latter often becomes aggravated on the subsidence of the former." Lastly, at p. 188, he gives a case of nervous symptoms which ceased on the appearance of a carbuncle, returning as soon as the latter healed, and ceasing again on the appearance of a second. All these cases are instances of the truth of HAHNEMANN'S doctrine of Psora, illustrating even its hereditary nature; and are proofs of what the more learned of the Allopaths now admit to be true, under the name of the "herpetic diathesis." Dr. Kidd does not perceive this, but talks learnedly about "dissimilar action" and "natural counter-irritation." It is nothing of the sort, however, and just as M. Jourdain found he had talked prose all his life without knowing it, so Dr. Kidd has been proving the truth of what he calls HAHNEMANN'S "speculations about Psora;" all the while remaining in blissful ignorance of the interesting fact!

*Apropos* of this matter, the following quotation from the late Dr. Grauvogl—no Hahnemannian, though a physician of immense learning—may be of use. "The gentlemen of these Schools know nothing more of the itch than that a mite, the *Acarus scabiei*, produces it. But had they only been practising physicians twenty-five years ago, at which time cases of itch were to be seen of the severest and most extensive kind, then they would have found that many of these patients not only had these eruptions, but were frequently attacked at the same time with violent fever of acute forms, inflammations of all kinds, etc.; that after the destruction of all the mites, and the removing by inunction of the copiously discharging eruptions, such diseases rapidly ran a fatal course, or left behind them chronic diseases; that hence these violent phenomena constantly following the itch, could not be dependent merely upon the presence of the mites, but upon their specific excretion or

excrements taken up by the blood, *if indeed it may not be assumed, from historic facts, that the acarus itself is not always the cause, but rather the result, the final product.* But since, for many years past, on account of police regulations,\* the itch mite is not only much less often found, but is at once destroyed when its first appearance is observed, and its further reproduction is rendered impossible; since the disease has become harmless on account of the infinitely small number of mites when compared with the billions which formerly used to abide in one human skin; since, moreover, the physiology, pathology, and therapeutics of the present day have become a feeble product of modern times, and for these the whole history of medicine is written in vain; therefore physicians, *in their indescribable shortsightedness*, allow themselves to make *the most fabulous comments* on the experiences of an Autenrieth, a HAHNEMANN, &c. BUT LET IGNORANCE DO AS IT PLEASES; WE ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS ACTS OR VIEWS." (*Lehrbuch der Homœopathie*, 1865, part 2, section 292.)

Dr. Kidd, apparently anticipating some awkward questions as to why he attacks HAHNEMANN, refusing to be guided exclusively by the law of Similars, and yet retains the name of Homœopathic physician, now quotes from one of his own way of thinking—Dr. W. H. Holcombe. "Some people suppose that a physician, professing belief in homœopathic law, is obliged to limit his practice strictly to the application of that law. He is not to administer a purgative, or to give an opiate, or to prescribe quinine, or to recommend a mineral water, under any circumstances, without in some way incurring the suspicion of sailing under false colours, of having deserted his creed and betrayed his principles. To those who cannot rise above the mere partisan spirit of cliques and schools, this may seem to be a righteous judgment. The man, however, who is loyal only to nature and to truth regards such restrictions as sheer impertinence, and claims everything which *cures*, be the process explainable or not, as inalienably his own. He is astonished at the blindness and bigotry of the Old School, who permit the grandest treasures of the curative art to lie unrecognised before them. He sets them a nobler example. He cultivates assiduously his own special field of science, but if he finds any

\* This applies to Germany.



residuum of truth or usefulness in Allopathy, or any other system, he asks no man's permission to use it ; but, acknowledging its source, appropriates it by divine right as the legitimate property of every healer of the sick."

All this sounds very fine and plausible, and, doubtless, to unthinking minds, will seem the very *ne plus ultra* of scientific liberality ; viewed more closely, however, we find the asinine ears barely concealed within the leonine skin. In the first place, to say that we forbid a professing Homœopath "to prescribe *Quinine*, or to recommend a mineral water, *under any circumstances*," is sheer lunacy. Dr. Holcombe and Dr. Kidd both know—or if they do not, it is time they did—that *Quinine*, and many *Mineral Waters* have been proved on healthy persons, and that we prescribe them as we do all other medicines, in accordance with those provings. Again, to demand that we shall be at liberty to employ "anything which *cures*, be the process explainable or not," is either a *petitio principii*, or a wilful throwing of dust in the readers' eyes. We maintain—and we appeal to all existing and future provings of medicines in confirmation of our statement—that every *really striking* cure is effected on the law of Similars. Slight cases, single symptoms, or isolated diseased states, which are but parts of the whole, and acute diseases running a self-limited course in previously healthy persons, may, indeed, be "cured" by other means—if, indeed, we can apply the term "cure" to what is rather guiding the ship safely through the breakers than quelling the storm itself—but these exceptions only prove the rule, and the "cures" thus made are far inferior to those which follow the application of the UNIVERSAL law of healing, *Similia similibus curentur*.

But the most subtle evasion of truth in the above quotation has yet to be touched by the spear of Ithuriel, and revealed in all its naked deformity. Dr. Holcombe, in order to prove his point, deliberately mixes up two perfectly distinct matters. The question here is not what is *true*, but what is *Homœopathy*. This would seem to be self-evident, but there are none so blind as those who will not see. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not for a moment admit that Homœopathy and Therapeutic truth can ever be at variance ; we *know* from practical experience that Homœopathy, strictly and faithfully carried out, is the best of all methods of

healing, and will cure all eases which can be cured at all; but this is not the point. HAHNEMANN promulgated, developed, and established a system of drug-healing, which he called Homœopathy, and in his *Organon* he has given us the rules of that art. Surely, according to all rules of logic and common sense, "Homœopathy" must mean that system to which HAHNEMANN gave this name. If not, what does it mean? To whom are we to go for a definition thereof, if not to the Founder? Those who inquire for the meaning of the term, not in the *Organon*, but in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, and maintain on purely philological grounds that it must mean merely the selection of the remedy according to the law of Similars, *and nothing more*—though even this is more than they often observe in practice themselves—these men, we say, have only to carry out their principles a little further, and refuse the term "Electricity" to the lightning, because the word is derived from "Electron,"—primarily signifying the electricity derived from *Amber*—to show how utterly foolish such quibbles are.

The whole question in dispute is therefore clear and self-evident. We do not wish, even if we had the power, to limit the practice of any physician; we have no quarrel with any man, *provided his practice agrees with his profession*, and it is for this very reason that we so seldom feel called upon to say a word against our Allopathic brethren, many of whom we highly esteem. Every physician is fully at liberty—nay, he is morally bound—to do whatever he considers best for his patient; but let him be honest in the matter, nor assume a title to which he has no right. We will illustrate the position we take by a parallel case. What would Dr. Kidd say if Dean Stanley or Canon Farrar were to rise in an assembly of "Brethren," and insist on giving utterance to their views on the inspiration of the scriptures or eternal punishment? We know that he would be one of the first to protest against such a violation of order. In vain might these learned divines protest that they were honest in their belief; that no man ought to be silenced, and that religious toleration was essential to liberty and progress. They would be simply told that their own church was the proper place from which to promulgate their views, and not the platform of a sect entirely opposed to such teaching. Such a decision would be perfectly right, for the question would not be



one of *truth*, but of *orthodoxy*; and if right in theology, why not in medicine? If certain so-called Homœopathic Societies still refuse to expel traitors and renegades, be it so; they will only the sooner hasten their own downfall. In the meantime, let it be known that it has been decided by eminent legal authority in the United States of America that any physician professing Homœopathy and practising something else is liable to a prosecution, since which decision many of the New York mongrels have deemed it advisable to leave the Homœopathic Society and Hospital, and establish institutions of their own. Perhaps a few trials for malpractice, or for obtaining money under false pretences, might also do wonders in Old England. The position which we hold, and shall ever hold, is this: No man is asked to call himself a Homœopath; if he believes Allopathy or Eclecticism to be the best system, by all means let him practice accordingly; but the soldier who refuses to wear the uniform of his regiment is tried by court-martial, and the physician who assumes the honourable name of Homœopath from mercenary motives, and yet refuses to practise it *exclusively* according to the best of his ability, will be also branded—if not by the law of his country, at least by the opinion of all true and honest men—as a traitor and a rebel.

The reader may ask, perchance, *why* the necessity for this opposition to those who falsely call themselves by the name of Homœopath. We are often told, “Why not leave the mongrels alone; if their practice is not as successful as your own, so much the worse for them; it will not hurt Homœopathy, and the public in time will find out the difference.” In time, perhaps; but while the grass grows the steed starves. Homœopathy, like every comparatively new (or renewed) system, labours under this disadvantage. If a patient consults an Allopath and derives no benefit, he rarely jumps to the conclusion that the whole art of medicine is a sham, but consults some one else, who may have better success. When, however, a patient “tries Homœopathy,” as he calls it, and tries in vain, he usually lays the blame, not on the individual physician, but on the system itself; a very illogical procedure, but people are often illogical. While the preceding pages were being written, we met with a case in point, one out of the very many which have fallen under our observation. A gentleman

whom we were attending said that his son-in-law was not very favourable to Homœopathy now. On inquiring the reason, we were told that, having some affection of the throat, he was advised to consult Dr. Kidd, who, he was told, was the "first homœopath in Great Britain." He consulted him, but failed to obtain a cure. Hence his present views on the subject of Homœopathy. Now, we do not of course wish to reflect upon Dr. Kidd for his failure; we all fail at times, and we might have failed ourselves; the patient might have been incurable. But, while we willingly submit to any censure we may incur for our own shortcomings,—for *humanum est errare*,—and utter no complaint, even if Homœopathy itself is discredited thereby, knowing that we have done our best to carry out HAHNEMANN'S rules; yet we will not consent that the failures of other men, who practise in quite a different style, shall be charged to our account. Let them keep their want of success to themselves; and if they make any "hits" (for they are generally chance cures) they are perfectly welcome to all the *éclat* they may bring them, in order to compensate for their frequent disappointments.

Some of our friends of the "other side," however, do not seem willing to consent to this arrangement: they still desire to be nominally connected with us, though we repudiate them; occasionally, by way of variety, uttering frantic and agonizing appeals to the Allopaths for recognition,—with what result every one knows! Thus, in the *Monthly Homœopathic Review*, 1877, pp. 673-4, one of the champions of this "Eclectic Homœopathy," writes as follows:—"If men have, in *bona fide*, cast in their lot with us; if they have sought membership in homœopathic societies,\* have written in homœopathic journals, and worked in homœopathic hospitals or dispensaries; if they are content, out of devotion to the common cause, to co-operate with their stricter colleagues, in spite of what they must consider their extravagances, surely the latter may be content to co-operate with them." HAHNEMANN'S true followers have obtained their success and reputation by closely adhering to their Master's teaching; and now a number of physicians, only half-educated in homœopathy, and only half believing

\* Dr. Kidd "sought membership" in the British Homœopathic Society, and a few years ago withdrew from that august body!

therein, want to join us and assume our name, appropriating to themselves a share of our glory, while putting upon our shoulders (in the eyes of the public, who, as we have just seen, do not always discriminate) a share of their blunders. And these men, forsooth, we are asked to receive as brother homœopathists. A very modest request, truly! We beg to inform them that it is politely declined with thanks, and that while we joyfully extend a helping hand to beginners who search for aid in the midst of their natural mistakes, to those who have deliberately made up their minds to reject HAHNEMANN's rules, vaunt the superiority of pathological theories to semeiological facts, habitually give medicines either mixed or in alternation, employ allopathic auxiliaries, such as leeches, blisters, purgatives, etc., and openly and unblushingly recommend their students to use avowedly unhomœopathic remedies "in suitable cases," we say, "You are Eclectics, (HAHNEMANN called you *Mongrels*), not Homœopaths, and we only acknowledge you as brethren, as we do the Allopaths, in that you are physicians; nor shall we cease to inform the public, in every possible way, that all is not gold that glitters, that by a large class of professed Homœopaths the laws of Homœopathy are more honoured in the breach than in the observance, and that we most deliberately and distinctly repudiate THE GREATER PORTION of what passes under the name of Homœopathy at the present day."

But to justify his departure from HAHNEMANN by actual facts, Dr. Kidd continues thus:—"Twenty-seven years ago, I saw that the essential truth of HAHNEMANN's law was totally independent of his speculations about dynamization. Adopting with great delight the law of '*Similia similibus curantur*' as the chief, though not the only, foundation for therapeutics, I learnt for myself that HAHNEMANN's 'sober' teaching, the use of the pure undiluted tinctures, was a far better guide to heal the sick than HAHNEMANN, 'drunk' with mysticism, calling for the exclusive use of infinitesimal doses. The latter I gradually cast aside *in toto*, as untrustworthy and unjust to the sick, whose diseases too often remained stationary under treatment by globules, but were most effectually and quickly cured by tangible doses of the same medicines which failed to cure when given in infinitesimal doses."

Now, this is practical and to the point; it is the result of

*experience.* But let us examine it minutely. When one who has never fully grasped the arcana of chemistry (and Dr. Kidd admits that he never accepted the law of Similars as anything more than the *chief* law of healing) fails to obtain the same results as a master, reasonable people conclude that the tyro has blundered somewhere, and that the fault lies with him, and not with the principles of the science. Dr. Kidd points to *his experience* as showing that infinitesimals are “untrustworthy;” but what if we can bring forward equal proofs of their efficacy? What if we can bring forward a witness whose evidence is fully as conclusive as that of Dr. Kidd, whose authority he must consider at least equal to any in the world—equal to his own? But who can this be? Can there be an authority equal to that of Dr. Joseph Kidd? Is there any one who has attained to such eminence that we dare to produce him as our champion on this momentous occasion, and bid him in our defence enter the lists against a physician who undertakes to prove the fallacy of *all* systems of medicine, that of HAHNEMANN not excepted, substituting for them his own “Laws of Therapeutics,” on which the future art and science of healing are to stand as firmly as the granite foundations of the world? Yes, there is one, but only one, whom we dare to name in this connection! Does the reader ask the name of this prodigy of learning and experience? *It is Dr. Kidd himself!*

Following the celebrated example of the Macedonian (we are glad to find that he remembers his Grecian history), Dr. Kidd appeals from HAHNEMANN “drunk with mysticism” to HAHNEMANN “sober;” *we* likewise appeal from Kidd “drunk” with self-conceit (and possibly “inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity”) to Kidd as a “sober” student of HAHNEMANN, before good fortune had so far turned his brain as to lead him to attempt to supersede his Master. In 1847 Dr. Kidd treated a large number of cases of fever and dysentery, in Ireland, chiefly with infinitesimals varying from the 3rd to the 12th potency.\* Though the surroundings of his patients were of the most unfavourable kind, Dr. Kidd’s success was far greater than that of the Allopaths, in spite of their excellent hospital accommodation; nay, his success was so marked, that he was charged by the enemies of Homœopathy with having

\* For the details, see *British Journal of Homœopathy*. vol. 6, p. 85.



“cooked the accounts.” We therefore invite Dr. Kidd to place himself on one of the horns of this dilemma,—and from this position he cannot escape ;—either these cases were fabricated, or they were not ; if they were, then Dr. Kidd is altogether unworthy of confidence ; if not, then *why cannot he do now what he could do thirty years ago?* Surely a physician’s powers of healing should increase, not decrease, with advancing age and experience. We would further ask him, seeing that it was only *twenty-seven* years ago that he “saw that the essential truth of HAHNEMANN’s law was totally independent of his speculations about dynamization,” &c., &c., what he was doing from 1847 to 1851 ? Were all his cases, treated with infinitesimals during that time, failures ? If not, why now ignore them ? If they were, perhaps he will favour his less fortunate brethren with his receipt for establishing a lucrative practice on the foundation of—nothing !

But has Dr. Kidd no idea *why* he now fails to cure with infinitesimals ? HAHNEMANN explains this also. In the note to Section 276 of his *Organon* he says, “The praise bestowed, of late years, by some few homœopathists, on the larger doses, depends on this, either that they chose low dynamizations of the medicine to be administered, as I myself used to twenty years ago, from not knowing any better, *or that the medicines selected were not perfectly homœopathic.*” Between the *Contrarium*, which by his own admission requires large doses, and the *Simillimum*, which his experience in 1847 proves to need only an infinitesimal dose, there are the varying grades of the *Similius* and the *Simile* ; and the best answer to an assertion on the part of Dr. Kidd or any one else that the small dose failed, is the question, “Did you give a *truly homœopathic* remedy ?”

In 1817 HAHNEMANN published, under the heading of “*Nota bene* for my Reviewers,” the following challenge :—“Take one case of disease after another, note it down according to the directions given in the *Organon*, especially in respect of all its discernable symptoms, in so exact a manner that the founder of Homœopathy himself shall be unable to find fault with the minuteness of the report (of course any case selected must be one for which a homœopathic medicine is to be found amongst those

medicines whose peculiar symptoms are known)\* and administer the most appropriate homœopathic medicinal substance that can be discovered, pure and unmixed, for the case of disease in question, in a dose as small as this doctrine directs; but, as is expressly insisted on, *taking care to remove all other kinds of medicinal influences from the patient*; and if it do not give relief—speedy, mild, and permanent relief—then by the publication of the duly attested history of the treatment *according to the principles of the homœopathic system strictly followed out*, you will be able to give a public refutation of this doctrine which so seriously threatens the old darkness. *But I pray you to beware of playing false in the matter; all roquetry comes to light and leaves an unfavourable stigma behind it as a warning.*”† Such is HAHNEMANN’S challenge, and we ask Dr. Kidd whether he has ever accepted it? Vague statements that a patient has been under “Homœopathic” treatment without success prove nothing; the very best of us may fail; the law is infallible, but we are not infallible in applying it; added to which, we regret to have to say that a very large number of those who profess to practise Homœopathy, and by whose success it is often judged, know about as much of the practical application of its laws as certain innocent politicians of the present day do of the subtleties of Russian diplomacy. No, no; Dr. Kidd has *never* accepted HAHNEMANN’S challenge. Those who have done so fairly, remain convinced of his accuracy. So far from high-potencies (or infinitesimal doses, as Dr. Kidd calls them,) being “untrustworthy,” they are the most efficacious of all, *provided always* the remedy is accurately selected. The habitual use of high-potencies is the best test of the excellence of the physician, and as HAHNEMANN said in 1833, will prove the “impassable gulf” between pure Homœopathy, and Allopathy or Mongrelism; not that the doctrine of high-potencies is the *foundation* of pure Homœopathy, but because it is both its most distinctive symbol in the eyes

\* This was written in 1817, when but few medicines were proved. Yet now, when we have nearly 1,000 proved remedies, there are found some who blame the imperfection of our *Materia Medica*, instead of their own incompetence, as the source of their failures. Surely if HAHNEMANN never needed to resort to Allopathic means, we, whose *armamentarium* is vastly greater than his, ought not to feel the necessity.

† The italics in the above quotation are HAHNEMANN’S.



of the public, and also necessitates for its successful application the most exact knowledge of the art and the most scrupulous observance of all its laws.

With this concludes what we may call the first part of Dr. Kidd's treatise, purporting to be a review and refutation of all the systems which have preceded him. To kick down the ladder by which one has risen in the world is, we believe, one of the axioms of "fashionable society," but besides being rather ungrateful, it is attended with certain disadvantages ; for if, on the one hand, the individual happens to be in any degree still supported by the ladder, he will assuredly come down with it ; if, on the other hand, the ladder proves to be too firmly fixed to be kicked down, the probabilities are that he will overbalance himself, and become an object of contempt and derision. When we reflect on all the misrepresentations of HAHNEMANN that we have pointed out, and remember that it is to that giant intellect whom he now slanders that Dr. Kidd is indebted for the very reputation he possesses, we are involuntarily reminded of the epithets which he applies to Paracelsus, "a man of the most consummate audacity and presumption."

*Mutato nomine, de te  
Fabula narratur.*

---

He is, however, but a poor reformer who pulls down, but is not able to build up ; let us see what Dr. Kidd has to offer in exchange for what he desires us to relinquish :—"The time has come," he says, "to dispense with hypothesis and theory. In medicine the ultimate appeal must be to facts, which true science discovers, arranges, combines, and interprets. It is precious work to clear away the gross darkness of mock science, *even when hid under an appearance of learning.*" With this last sentence we most entirely agree ; it is the very object of this Reply ! Dr. Kidd refers to the unerring and invariable laws of chemistry, light, heat, and other departments of universal science ; and from this uniformity and order in nature he justly argues by analogy that we should expect to find the same certainty of law in the treatment of disease. What therefore are these laws ? His answer to this question is to be looked for in the remaining chapters of his

treatise, in which he endeavours to illustrate his tenets by a series of cases with comments thereon.

Before examining these in detail, we must protest against a most unprofessional and even uncourteous feature of Dr. Kidd's narrations. We allude to his habit of mentioning the *names* of living Allopathic physicians whose treatment is said to have proved unsuccessful before *he* was consulted. \* All this is in exceedingly doubtful taste, and comes with a very bad grace from one who states in his very first page that "the true student of nature ever delights to lay self aside." All these physicians doubtless did their best, and if they failed to cure, the fault lay more in their system than in themselves. We maintain that it is only under the most exceptional circumstances that a physician can be justified in publicly *naming* any of his living brethren in connection with their mistakes, and common decency and regard for the feelings of men equally as honourable as himself, should have restrained him from pursuing such a line of conduct. Not only, however, are the failings of these Allopaths thus exposed to the public gaze, but even Dr. Kidd's own friends and co-professors of Homœopathy are treated in a similarly unprofessional way. Thus at page 81 we read :—"As he was getting worse, the patient's friends sent for Dr. Harper, who, *alarmed* by the dangerous predicament of the patient, telegraphed for me." At page 178 we read :—"Beginning to lose heart, Dr. Hewan said at our next consultation, 'We must give up the *Digitalis*.' 'No,' was my reply, 'but we must remove the obstacles to its action.'" We can only ask in astonishment and indignation, what need was there for all this? Even if Dr. Kidd's trumpeter were dead, and the vacant post of that important functionary not yet filled up, surely there was no occasion to announce to the public that Dr. Harper became "*alarmed*," and that Dr. Hewan "*lost heart*." Indeed, such a procedure on his part, to quote the words of Talleyrand, "was worse than a crime—it was a blunder;" for besides being rather ungrateful to expose the little weaknesses of those gentlemen who had just put the guineas

\* At p. 139 we read, "in an *agony of distress*, the mother asked Dr. [name given] to retire from the case, and sent for me;" and at page 168 we are told that "in an *agony of despair* his *distracted* wife telegraphed for me." Such "piling up the agony" may suit the claptrap of a fourth-rate provincial theatre, but in a professional work such sensational language should be conspicuous by its absence.

in his pocket, it was bad policy, for such tactics will rather tend to deter other members of the profession—even Dr. Kidd's dearest friends—from seeking his very valuable assistance on similar occasions. We cannot help wondering whether, if Dr. Kidd had been "alarmed," and sent for Dr. Harper, or had "lost heart," and sent for Dr. Hewan—may we be pardoned for suggesting the possibility of such a thing—or if his advice to these gentlemen had proved unsuccessful, we should have had the fact thus publicly proclaimed! Dr. Kidd may be a very great physician, possessed of superior powers of discernment—nay, we are bound to acknowledge him as such, since he to all intents and purposes tells us so—but we have good reasons for doubting his *infallibility*, either in treatment, diagnosis, or prognosis; and, after the example he has set us, he has only himself to blame if any of *his* shortcomings are hereafter exposed. In the meantime we would call his attention to an old proverb, "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

Dr. Kidd makes the following assertion:—"The physiological action of medicinal agents stands in some positive relationship to its curative action in disease. In most cases that relationship is either of similarity or contrariety. Some few instances seem to stand out, as of no apparent relationship, but they are few, and deeper investigation brings them in amenable to one or the other." From this it appears that Dr. Kidd maintains the existence of two *opposite* laws of therapeutics. Arguing from that very analogy to which he has already referred as proof presumptive of the existence of laws of therapeutics at all, we might reasonably conclude that such could not be the case. In chemistry we do not find that the combining proportion of oxygen is usually 16, and 17 in just a few exceptional cases; neither do we find here and there a planet disobeying the otherwise universal law of gravitation. Is it, then, likely that in therapeutics there can be two opposite *laws*, that of *Similars* and that of *Contraries*? A *law* of nature is infallible; it is universal and exclusive in its sphere of action; law admits of no exception, save when controlled by some other higher law (*e.g.*, the force of magnetism overcoming that of gravitation), and then this exception is found to be also universal when this higher law comes into operation, and so merely a further proof of the

universality of law. It would seem incredible, therefore, that there should be two *opposite* therapeutic laws, unless it can be shown that in the application of each, totally distinct forces—as distinct from each other as are magnetism and gravitation—are called into play; which is not the case. Hence, inasmuch as the principle of Contraries is necessarily, from its very nature, of limited application, that of Similars can be the only law.

Dr. Kidd points out a most important distinction between the workings of these two opposite principles. “When the relationship of the medicinal action is *contrary* to the signs and symptoms of disease, it is *necessary to give doses large enough to produce the full physiological or primary action*. Such doses must also be *frequently repeated, and for a long time*, so that by a succession of repressing actions the disease may be kept suspended or beaten down, *as directly the drug action is suspended the diseased activity reappears*.” Not a very pleasing picture truly; for besides the time required, and the strong possibility of failure, admitted even by Dr. Kidd, there is the almost certain risk of the production of unpleasant and even dangerous medicinal symptoms. On the other hand, Dr. Kidd informs us, when “the relationship is that of Similars, *the small dose is sufficient*.”

In this matter we are at one with our author, but after all there is nothing new in his statement; it is simply borrowed from HAHNEMANN. In his preface to *Camphor*, the latter says, of the the Siberian influenza, “*Camphor only serves as a palliative, but as a very valuable palliative; the disease being only of short duration, it is administered in frequent and always increasing (stronger) doses dissolved (as above described) in water. IT DOES NOT SHORTEN THE DURATION OF THE ATTACK, but mitigates it very much, and so guides it, no longer dangerous, to its departure. (On the other hand, a single dose of Nux-omica, provided it is administered in the smallest possible doses, CURES the disease HOMŒOPATHICALLY, frequently IN A FEW HOURS.*” In this paragraph, HAHNEMANN, while pointing out the good palliative action of *Camphor* in the disease,—a very useful piece of information at that time (1830), when homœopathic medicines could not be procured everywhere at a moment’s notice,—particularly points out that its palliative power is only dependent on the naturally short course of



the disease, and contrasts with it the far more rapidly and directly curative action of the *Homœopathic* remedy.\*

Chapters 6, 7 and 8, are devoted to illustrations of these two principles, both from his own, and from Allopathic practice. It would have been more easy to follow Dr. Kidd, however, had he observed some slight degree of arrangement in his book. In Chapter 7, entitled "Galen's law, the Antipathic," we meet with cases that should have found their place in Chapter 6, entitled "HAHNEMANN'S Law of Similars;" and in the latter we find recorded a case of threatened abortion stopped by the application of leeches to the ovarian region! With regard to this latter case, Dr. Kidd, as a professed Homœopath of some thirty years' standing, ought by this time to know that "Homœopathy sheds not a drop of blood" (preface to HAHNEMANN'S *Organon*); and, moreover, that to claim the abstraction of blood as a simile to abortion, of which the hæmorrhage is only one of the concomitant symptoms, betrays either gross carelessness, or an ignorance which we cannot venture to characterize. The only conceivable reason for his extraordinary assumption is that he has just quoted the words of an *Allopath*, Sir Thomas Watson, "Herein we are guilty of Homœopathy; to prevent bleeding we draw blood." Alas, when professed Homœopaths resort to their avowed enemies for a definition of their own system!

Some of Dr. Kidd's illustrations of the Law of Similars are certainly wide of the mark. The cure (p. 112) of a lunatic by vegetables given because he used to eat *grass*, is merely an instance of the wisdom of obeying the voice of nature with regard to *diet*. Again, on p. 107, we are told that iritis of one eye was *cured* by the vapour of *Prussic Acid*, but that on applying it to the other eye, to improve the sight, an attack of iritis was *produced* therein. What cured this second attack, or whether it was cured at all, we are not told. There are, however, no symptoms in our present provings of *Prussic Acid* suggesting its homœopathicity in iritis, and we have a strong suspicion that this "cure" was only a case of metastasis from one eye to the other. A similar occurrence under Allopathic doses of *Mercury* is on record. With these ex-

\* Yet, in spite of all this, we find the editor of the *North American Journal of Homœopathy* asserting (August, 1878, p. 127) that our Master RECOMMENDED such palliatives; an assertion possibly based on Hempel's atrocious mistranslation of the above quotation.



ceptions, however, Dr. Kidd's illustrations are fair average cases, though far surpassed by many of those reported by Homœopathic physicians. But their great fault is this: there is an utter want of that explanation as to *why* the remedy was selected in preference to others having a very similar action, which, after his praise of HAHNEMANN'S "model of accurate description," we might reasonably have expected—an explanation, moreover, which alone can render a case *instructive*. To quote one out of many, we find at p. 101 a case of frequently-recurring attacks of spasm of the gall ducts, caused by the passage of *inspissated bile* and gall-stones, and often terminating in jaundice, cured (after many fruitless trials) by *inspissated ox-gall*. Dr. Kidd quotes several analogous cases; *e.g.*, *alkalinity* of the urine cured by *alkalies*; spasms, with *sour vomiting*, cured by *lemon juice*. We should naturally, therefore, hope to have arrived at something definite at last,—at one of the Laws of Therapeutics,—and to be able to state positively that the passage of inspissated bile is an infallible Homœopathic indication for administering inspissated ox-gall. But we are doomed to disappointment. In spite of the success of this case, and in spite of all his fine rhetoric about "the simplicity of the means of cure," and the simile that "out of one hundred keys there may be only one that will open the lock," we find him (p. 192) using, with benefit, the galvanic current in a similar case! It is certainly discouraging to find a would-be *teacher* of "Laws of Therapeutics" flirting first with one "specific" and then with another, apparently without rhyme or reason. Dr. Kidd says (p. 222) "Genius often oversteps the boundaries of science, when the latter degenerates into routine or safe orthodoxy. When strict theorists and dogmatists give an uncertain sound, it needs a dash of empiricism to cast aside conflicting theories and arrive at truth by insight." Perhaps Dr. Kidd was possessed of some superhuman degree of "genius" and "insight" which led him to vary the remedy in the above analogous cases; but it is certainly tantalizing to the average physician to receive no hints whatever which might help him to discriminate between the two, and tempts him to parody the words of Capt. Macheath, and sing,

How successful should I be with either  
Were t'other specific away:

though it is to be hoped that, *ad majorem gloriam—Kiddii*, he will not continue,

But since you perplex me together,  
To neither a word will I say!

In the meantime, we will just mention that this “insight” sometimes leads its fortunate (?) possessor into a ditch, and though Dr. Kidd says, “while investigators and microscopists are working in the elucidation of the etiology and pathology of cholera, it is well for practical medicine that the instinct of *genius* should lead Niemeyer to the conclusion that there ‘is one clinical symptom of the most guiding value, the diarrhœa; and one pathological fact proved, viz., the intestinal lesion; and only one sort of treatment, the empiric management of this intestinal catarrh,’” we should not forget that all this fine talk happens to be utterly wrong, for in the very worst cases of choleraic collapse there is little or no purging at all! Possibly it was some unusual and abnormal development of this faculty that once led a daring Allopathic innovator to treat cholera by—plugging the rectum with a cork! So much for “genius” and “insight,” when uncontrolled by law. *Verbum sap.*

In Chapter 4, on “Galen’s law, the Antipathic,” Dr. Kidd hazards a remarkable assertion. “Rejoicing to enlarge the boundaries of knowledge, true science cannot ignore any law, though its sphere of action be limited, and not of universal application. Galen’s law of ‘*contraria contrariis*’ has its place, and a very important place still, in the practice of EVERY physician.” To this impudent assertion we give the most unqualified denial. It is true that those whom HAHNEMANN, in his disgust with their folly, and indignation at the falsity of their pretensions, denounced as “MONGRELS,” do frequently resort to Allopathic practices; \* but “Galen’s law” holds *no place*

\* The following “last sweet thing in mongrelism,” from a neighbouring practitioner whose name is in the “Homœopathic” Directory, has just reached us. We give it *verbatim et literatim* :—

“One egg well beaten; White Vinegar 8 oz.; Sp. Camphor 2 oz.; Turpentine  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.; Tr. Capsicum  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.; Ess. Lemon  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.; Tr. Rhus Tox 1 oz.

“Ol. Lavender to suit smell. Colour with Cochineal? Mix in order, and shake well before adding each ingredient.

“*For use.*—Sponge the part with hot water; wipe dry; rub on, allowing it to dry in before the fire.”

*whatever* in the practice of those who still, as they ever will, defend the HAHNEMANNIC flag. Dr. Kidd's statement is a foul slander on ourselves and all other of HAHNEMANN'S adherents. *He* and *his* followers may resort to the law of contraries ; the law of similars in *their* hands may not be always sufficient to heal, though whether such insufficiency is inherent in the law or in those who apply it, we leave our readers to judge. *We*, however, *never* give medicines for the cure of disease on any other law than that of similars, *and have never any occasion to do so.*

We will now examine Dr. Kidd's supposed proofs of the value of "Galen's law," in order that we may determine, *from his own statements*, not only whether it does or does not exist as a law of healing, but also, if the former be true, in what class of diseases its sphere of action lies. The following are the cases in which he affirms that this law comes into play :—(1) The relief of calculi in the kidneys or ureters by *Alkalies* ; (2) *Atropine* to dilate the pupil in iritis ; (3) *Bromide of Potassium* in epilepsy, etc. ; (4) *Secale* to arrest uterine hæmorrhage or expedite delivery ; (5) *Purgatives* to overcome intestinal obstruction ; and (6) *Iodide of Potassium* in tertiary symptoms. From this statement we can only deduce one out of two conclusions ; either, according to Dr. Kidd, *all* such cases must thus be treated by Contraries, not being amenable to the law of Similars ; or else this law of Contraries only applies to *exceptional* cases in the above classes of disease. If he implies the former, then his *dictum* is opposed to the experience of all Homœopathic physicians, and is even contradicted in part by his own ; if the latter, since he gives not even a hint for the identification of these exceptional cases, our Teacher (!) leaves us nearly as much in the dark as we were before. Now, let us take his assertions *seriatim*. (1) *Calculi*. Dr. Kidd should not forget that what may be incurable in *his* hands may not be incurable in the hands of another possessed of greater knowledge, and that to say that a case can only be relieved by palliatives because *he* cannot do better, is a rash assertion ; but admitting that there are cases which, from their very nature and condition, are only susceptible of *relief*, why should we desert Homœopathy here ? Surely to *cure* is a greater work than to *relieve* ; if Homœopathy can do the former, when it is possible, why cannot it also achieve the latter ?

Our own experience, and that of all other Homœopaths, is that in incurable cases more relief in the long run is obtained by the administration of the *simillimum* than by the use of palliatives, which, though they may give relief for a time, even complete cessation of pain if the patient be narcotized, yet are followed by a reaction, often more severe than before, and necessitating still larger and larger doses of the palliative, till at last the wretched victim of empiricism sinks beneath the twofold load of the disease and the poisonous action of the drug. (2) *Atropine* in iritis. We have never had occasion to prescribe for iritis otherwise than on the Homœopathic law, and the *simillimum* is quite sufficient in these cases to remove the inflammation and cause the absorption of the lymph which so often distorts the pupil; yet, even when *Atropine* is used by the Allopaths in these cases, its action is merely *mechanical*, serving to dilate the pupil, and so break down the adhesions; it is no more an instance of the law of Contraries than is the forcible breaking down of the adhesions of a contracted limb. (3) *Bromide of Potassium* in epilepsy. Dr. Kidd not only claims that its action in this disease is Antipathic, but goes so far as to say that "most of the uses of *Bromide of Potassium* are very distinctly in a relationship of 'contrary' to its effects on the healthy human body." Dr. Kidd ought to be an authority on the action of this salt, judging from the frequency with which we have seen it in his prescriptions;\* but in this case he happens to be quite wrong. If he will refer to the *Medical Times and Gazette*, 1864, vol. i., p. 96, he will find this remarkable statement from an Allopath:—"M. Guerin did not consider the *Bromide of Potassium* a merely inoffensive remedy, as it has given rise in his hands to *nervous accidents* RESEMBLING EPILEPSY." This is quite

\* One now lying before us, dated Dec. 8th, 1876, is as follows:—

"*Ammonii. Brom.* ʒ iii.

*Potassii. Brom.* ʒ vi.

*Aqua. Dest.* ad ʒ iv.

Two teaspoonsful in a wineglass of water at bedtime, and half as much in the early morning." And another:—

"*Ammon. Brom.* ʒ iv.

*Potass. Brom.* ʒ viii.

*Aqua.* ʒ vi.

Three teaspoonsful every morning, and one at night." We should like to know on what law Dr. Kidd mixes these two medicines.



conclusive as to its *homœopathicity*, and Dr. Kidd should make himself a little more acquainted with a subject before he rushes into print thereon. (4) *Secale* in uterine hæmorrhage or to expedite delivery. Does Dr. Kidd mean seriously to tell the Homœopathic profession that *Secale* is *not* homœopathic to uterine hæmorrhage? If so, we can only advise him for the sake of his own reputation to study his *Materia Medica* under some competent master, who may be able to prevent him from making a second time such an egregious blunder in public. But to expedite delivery, some one will say, surely that is an antipathic action? Not so; else it would *always* have to be given, as Dr. Kidd admits of remedies administered on this principle, in *large* doses. Not only, however, does Dr. H. N. Guernsey assert that by far the best potency of *Secale*, for weak or suppressed pains, is the 200th or higher; but even Dr. C. J. Hempel (whose hatred to the high potencies was such that he even *suppressed*, in his translation of HAHNEMANN, certain statements in their favour) had to confess that he had “seen marked and even painful uterine contractions take place immediately after the exhibition of the 200th potency.” (5) *Purgatives* in obstruction of the bowels. To this we need hardly reply; Dr. Kidd’s own case, at p. 111, is a sufficient proof that the law of Homœopathy does not fail here. (6) *Iodide of Potassium* in tertiary symptoms. Dr. Kidd’s teaching on this disease is *sui generis*, and we invite the special attention of his admirers to it. At p. 122 he says, “The physiological action of *Iodide of Potassium* is akin to the ulceration of the mucous membrane of the nose and throat. It is much less analogous to the deep-seated tertiary symptoms, such as disease of the liver or of the coats of blood-vessels. In such, even when given in large doses, it seldom cures, but gives the most signal temporary relief; after a time the disease reappearing, to be again beaten down by the same medicine. By a succession of palliative actions cure may result, the disease getting weaker after each palliation. Such indirect cure is slower and less effectual than when the direct specific action of medicine is applicable.” At pp. 146–8, however, Dr. Kidd states that the action of this drug is “that of contrary” to both secondary and tertiary symptoms, and records a case of secondary ulceration of the throat where five grain doses of this remedy always *relieved* for a time,



but never *cured*. Perhaps Dr. Kidd will explain what he really does mean; we are aware that the pathology of this disease is in some respects obscure, and that there are differences of opinion thereon, but that a physician, not to say a teacher of "Laws of Therapeutics," should flatly contradict himself within the small space of thirty pages, we were not prepared to discover. By way of aiding him in his evident perplexity, we will state that symptoms 637 and 639 of Allen's *Materia Medica* clearly show the homœopathicity of *Iodide of Potassium* to some of the tertiary forms of the disease in question.

So much, therefore, for Dr. Kidd's advocacy of the law of Contraries. His very best illustrations thereof prove, after all, to be illustrations of the law of *Similars*. Only when there is at least some degree of similarity do we find that "by a succession of palliative actions cure may result, the disease getting weaker after each palliation," and only when the *Simillimum* is prescribed shall we find that single doses of the highest potencies cure. When the medicine is antipathic, its palliative effect grows less and less at each repetition, and the disease (unless self-limited and naturally tending to recovery) becomes more and more obstinate, owing to the reaction of the organism. After the narration of the case last referred to, Dr. Kidd exclaims, "What a boon to the patient when a dexterous knowledge of the science and art of medicine enables the doctor to prescribe what cures the disease permanently, and does not require perpetual dosing." We can fully understand his mortification at such an imperfect result as the above case shows; but the remedy is in his own hands: let him adhere faithfully to HAHNEMANN, and he will no longer complain.

The chapter entitled "Ars Medica" treats on the maxim *Tolle causam*. The directions given by HAHNEMANN on this subject are clear and rational; they tell us to remove the cause of the symptom when it can be done, *e.g.*, a foreign body, or a poison. Yet Dr. Kidd, in common with his Allopathic brethren, misunderstands and perverts this plain rule into endeavouring to remove some symptom which, though prominent, is not the first cause of the disease, but only an effect. Thus the operation of iridectomy may greatly relieve glaucoma, but it does not cure the constitu-

tional dyscrasia which is the cause of it, and with it the acute symptoms also, as Homœopathy can do. Even in the more simple cases in which symptoms dependent on a misplaced uterus are removed by the mechanical adjustment of that organ, the same objection holds good; it is but a *relief*, not a *cure*; for when the patient is *cured* Homœopathically, the weakened ligaments recover their tone, without any mechanical aid, and with this restoration to their normal state, the painful symptoms resulting from the former displacement permanently cease. Not a word, moreover, does Dr. Kidd say about the pain and injury which these mechanical contrivances often cause!

Dr. Kidd next treats on "Obstacles to the Action of Medicine." We only know of three possible "Obstacles:" (1) the non-homœopathicity of the remedy, for the frequency of which we need only refer to the cases published in the journals; (2) medicinal antidotes being taken by the patient, who thinks he can do no harm by supplementing the physician's work by a little *Aconite* for fever, or some other vagary; and (3) persistence in some error of hygiene which may be the exciting cause of the disease. Dr. Kidd, however, refers to a different kind of "obstacle." "The study of heart diseases is one of the most interesting and complex of all studies. Here it is that a *sound knowledge of chemical and mechanical laws* is essential to successful treatment." . . . "Dropsy from disease of the kidneys can be cured without purgatives, but dropsy from heart disease, with constipation, finds no relief from any treatment till the constipation is relieved, when the specific heart medicine acts like a charm on the dropsy." According to the rules of Kiddopathy, we are not, it would seem, to select a remedy homœopathic to the *totality* of the symptoms, *including the constipation*, but to remove the latter by purgatives first, and then to give the specific for the heart! To prove his assertion, Dr. Kidd gives us three cases of edema (*sic*) from heart disease,—for the bronchitis case, introduced here in order to show the efficacy of the inhalation of steam, has nothing to do with the subject of this chapter, and is only another proof of the defective arrangement of the book,—all of them treated chiefly with *large* doses of *Digitalis*, and all *uncured*, though temporarily relieved, *two proving fatal*. Not a very promising batch of cases on which

to base a rule of practice ! Examining these three cases in detail, we find that case 1 received *Digitalis* ONLY ; this, therefore, proves nothing. In case 2 there was edema (*sic*) with *loose* bowels. *Digitalis* was given with temporary relief. A relapse occurred, and the *same* remedy was given, *but without effect*. It is extremely rare for the same remedy to be indicated in a relapse ; generally there are some new symptoms (often minute and *apparently* insignificant) which point to a different medicine, and in that case we need never expect any benefit from a repetition of the same, which has now done its work. We do not find from his account that Dr. Kidd made any investigation for these symptoms ; on the contrary, *though there is no constipation mentioned*, he adopted the much less laborious plan of giving half-ounce doses of *Sulphate of Magnesia* ! Under this treatment there was again a relief, and again a relapse. *Again* was the *Digitalis* given without result ; *again* was the purgative given, but this time to no purpose. Now *Nux-vomica* was given in addition to the *Digitalis* ; the patient was relieved, but remained subject to relapses. What Dr. Kidd wishes to teach by this case is not very clear ; it is, however, worth reading—as a warning. By a remarkable coincidence, though we had no professional connection with the third case, we were well acquainted with its details at the time they occurred, and happen to know that Dr. Kidd's version of it—not altogether free from egotism and self-laudation—is extremely inaccurate, containing important errors, not only as to the patient's age, his previous medical history, and the nature and result of his former treatment, but even as to the duration of his life and the ultimate causes of death. Taking the case, however, as it stands, inasmuch as it is the only one of the three in which constipation existed at all, we will put to the test the support which Dr. Kidd supposes it gives to his new rule of practice. Dr. Kidd informs us that he gave large doses of *Digitalis*—so large as to act prejudicially on the patient—without relief : at last he gave a “brisk mercurial purgative,” upon which “the obstacle being removed,” the former remedy “acted like a charm,” producing free diuresis ! We can only say that it is a pity that Dr. Kidd did not refer his remarks on this case to some really scientific Allopath before publishing them. Had he done so, he would have learned that the diuresis was

due, not to the *Digitalis* at all, but to the *Mercurial*,\* and that his supposed obstacles-to-the-action-of-medicine theory, though announced as the outcome of "sound knowledge," was simply a "mare's nest!"

On "Counter-irritation," "Galvanism," and "Hydropathy," we need say little. The best cures by the various modifications of Electricity have been recently shown to be (like all other *good* cures) really effected on the Homœopathic law; and though Hydropathy is not a system of drug-action at all, yet the same law also affords the best clue to the successful application of water at various degrees of temperature, *e.g.*, hot bathing for inflamed parts, cold bathing for cold feet, the reverse being sometimes very prejudicial, as Dr. Kidd admits. Counter-irritation he also claims to act best under the law of Similars, though only two pages further on he says, that it is "the more beneficial the more it is prescribed under the reign of the law of similars *or of contraries*." Leaving to him to explain this contradiction, by no means the only one in this compilation, we will say that if this chapter is intended as a defence of his own unhomœopathic practices by claiming for them an affinity with the law of HAHNEMANN, it is very lame indeed. The "cure" of hydrocele by the injection of *Iodine* is not a homœopathic action at all; for the chronic inflammation which is the cause of the abnormal secretion of serum is not cured by the artificially-excited acute inflammation *per se*, but the re-accumulation of the fluid is mechanically prevented by the resultant adhesion of the two layers of the serous membrane. As for the "excellent effect" of "the use of hot mustard foot-baths in acute mania," this relief is simply caused by the *narcotic* effect of

\* Dr. Skinner furnishes us with the following important note, based upon his former extensive Allopathic practice:—"We have no hesitation in stating that in such a case as Dr. Kidd narrates—*where all the secretions are locked up—kidneys, skin, and bowels*—we have repeatedly seen five or ten grains of Calomel, or five grains of Blue-pill and the same quantity of Pil. Coloc. Co., or still better, a dose of Calomel and Jalap, *set all the secretions free*, and a temporary change for the better take place as in Dr. Kidd's case without any *Digitalis* or other medicines whatever; but the more often such treatment is repeated, the nearer the approach of death! We have seen twenty-seven years of such practice. *Mercurius* is possibly the Homœopathic *simillimum* to the conditions *italicised*, and if given high enough a more permanent result might have been effected. We select *Mercurius*, because no such action will take place if the *Mercurial* is omitted, however powerful the purgative."



the baths, as Dr. Kidd may find out for himself if he tries them. Yet even where the homœopathicity of a counter-irritant is more evident, it is of a most imperfect kind. The action of a blister may be akin to inflammation of a serous membrane, but this is all; it is crudely homœopathic *to but one symptom*, and hence, the *totality* of the symptoms not being met, it cannot be expected to do more than *palliate*; and even this palliation (poor as it is) is often too dearly purchased. Such adjuvants as the application of hot and cold water under the homœopathic law may be used with safety, and at times with advantage (though they do but palliate), because the effect which they produce is due to their *physical* properties of temperature and moisture, and they do not, unless employed to excess, disturb the other functions of the body; but this cannot be said of *medicinal* counter-irritants, such as mustard and blisters, whose action on the healthy parts is often most prejudicial, besides being found quite unnecessary by those who have mastered the HAHNEMANNIC method.

We now arrive at the "Conclusion" of this work, in which the "Empirical method" is delineated. Of this method, in which "genius" and "insight" are to play so important a part, we are told (pp. 222, 225) that "there will ever be a large field for empirical medicine," which "has conferred many rich gifts upon the science and art of medicine;" at p. 224, however, we read that "the amount of tribute which it has rendered to practical medicine is small."!! Which of these two contradictory propositions we are to accept as Dr. Kidd's real belief, will perhaps be cleared up when it is also explained how empiricism, which ordinary mortals have always believed to imply the *absence of law*, "is fruitful and progressive *only when sustained by law*."!!

As a practical illustration of his "empirical method," Dr. Kidd devotes an appendix to Cancer, which he claims to be "a grand field for empirical science." After suggesting the local application of *Chromic* or *Osmic Acids* to, "as it were, encase these microscopic cells and coagulate or harden the intercellular fluid" (which, on *theoretical* pathological grounds, ought to do the work, but which by his own showing Dr. Kidd has never successfully used at all), he gives utterance to the touching confession, that "in an extensive practice during thirty years, with a large number of



unsuccessful cases, I have been THREE TIMES *encouraged* (!) as to the *possibility* of curing cancer." And on further examining these cases we find that in one the disease returned in another organ after twelve years; one has been well for five years; and the third is only just cured! Truly a very poor foundation for empiricism; the empiricism which led him in the first case to give *Arsenic*, and in the other two *Hydrastis* and *Chloroform*, apparently without any other reason than that suggested by his own "genius" and "insight," too deep and awful for ordinary minds to grasp!

The crucial test of any system is the *comparative* one. Dr. Kidd has, in this work, adduced some cases of cure after the failure of the Allopathic system. It is true that the errors into which he has fallen with regard to his last "edema" (*sic*) case tends to make us distrustful of the rest: nevertheless we will not question them; it is the province of the Allopaths to fight their own battles, and, moreover, Kiddopathy, like Dr. Samuel Dickson's Chronothermalism, has just enough Homœopathy in it to render it reasonably probable that it would be more productive of good results than a system from which Homœopathy was altogether excluded, except by accident. HAHNEMANN, as we have already seen, has thrown down his gauntlet, which Dr. Kidd has not ventured to take up; this very book is a challenge of Kiddopathy against all comers; we accept it.

At pp. 75-6 Dr. Kidd says, "Congestion of the brain often finds spontaneous relief in epistaxis, or in bleeding piles." . . . "To stand before nature and ask questions, we must accept the answers given, *and act accordingly*. A leech or two to the nostrils, in such cases, will do more good than the withdrawal of a quart of blood from the arm. *Woe to the patient with congestion of brain when medical science degenerates into expectancy, and when the doctor neglects true curative means till blood has been extravasated into the brain to damage its structure for the rest of life.*" Thus says Dr. Kidd. The logic of this advice may fairly be questioned, for the curative efforts of nature are the efforts of a *diseased* organism, and so necessarily imperfect, and not to be imitated. But to the test.

A few years ago, Dr. —, a *pretended* Homœopath, was seized with congestion of the brain, for which another *pretended* Homœo-

path, whose authority as an exponent and representative of Kiddopathy not even Dr. Kidd would call in question, prescribed *leeches*, *blisters*, and TWENTY GRAINS of *Bromide of Potassium* every two hours! Wishing to ascertain further particulars, we made inquiries, and received from one of the physicians in attendance the following reply :—"I am sorry to say what you have heard about A. is correct. I was with B. for about three hours after his attack, and left him with returning consciousness, able to speak, and the laboured breathing gone; this under *Arnica*. A. had been telegraphed for; he saw him soon after, and put him on *Aconite*; he then had *Gelseminum*. The upshot was I had to withdraw; so had C., whom I had asked to see him; we could not stand A.'s dosing. I asked A. what on earth made him stop the *Arnica* that was acting so splendidly; he said he had no confidence in *Arnica* in such cases; he did not believe it acted on the head more than on the big toe!!!\* Then followed the treatment you have heard of. I saw B. to-day, and regret to say that there is but little, if any, improvement since I saw him. . . . Up to the time that A. appeared he was mending steadily."† Five days afterwards, Dr. B. (who, by the way, desired to be bled!) was a corpse, leaving to his Homœopathic (!?) friend the poor satisfaction of having treated him *secundum artem*, and so fulfilled HAHNEMANN'S prediction.

We regret that we cannot compliment Dr. Kidd, if only on his literary abilities. It might perhaps be beyond the bounds of polite criticism to designate this parti-coloured patchwork as the "hairbrained chatter of irresponsible frivolity;" yet assuredly a treatise so abounding in sensational description, grandiloquent phraseology, repetitions and other inelegancies of diction, flavoured though it be for the "unco guid" with a little of the spice of Biblical quotations and pious reflections, differs *toto cœlo* from that calm, deliberate, judicial, self-possessed style, that

\* This remark only shows the consummate ignorance of the man who uttered it; Allen's *Encyclopædia* gives seven symptoms of *Arnica* belonging to the big toe, and nearly one hundred belonging to the head!!!!

† Not wishing to imitate Dr. Kidd's bad example of mentioning names, we have substituted letters. Most, however, will know the ease to which we refer; it created considerable indignation at the time, even in the minds of many of the mongrels, who drew the line at leeches and blisters.

should ever be a characteristic of a work of such claims, without which even one far less shallow must inevitably incur the charge of mediocrity. Viewed as a scientific production for the instruction and guidance of professional men, its demerits are still more patent. As an *Organon* of a new system of the healing-art, it is a failure, and as an exposition of the Laws of Therapeutics it is quite valueless. The author does not fairly settle the question in favour of the law of Similars, and his illustrations of the law of Contraries are either negative, proving nothing, or are antagonistic to his own thesis. We find nothing *definite*; similars, we are told, cure some cases, contraries cure others, while a *tertium quid*, under the names of "inspiration," "genius," and "insight," is to cure a few more; but when each is to be resorted to we have no clear intimation. Very different from the teachings of the Master! The philosophic pretensions of the title-page are utterly misleading; some raw material of medical philosophy (borrowed mostly from others) may be found here, but the philosophic fabric is wanting; and we can only say of this book, as we said of the Text-book of another hybrid monstrosity—Organopathy—that it will be accepted and valued by the profession—when HAHNEMANN is forgotten! We would also suggest to Dr. Kidd himself the propriety of considering whether he, while holding the views therein enunciated, does not place himself in a false position by allowing his name to be publicly connected with the London School of *Homœopathy* and enrolled in the *Homœopathic Directory*.

*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis  
Tempus eget.*